

*(Excerpt from report prepared by Philip B. Huffman in association with Heritage Partners, Inc., for the National Park Service, 1999.)*

## NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVE

### Overview

Several types of coordinating entities could be considered for implementation of a national heritage corridor designation in the Champlain Valley. These fall into two general categories: existing entities (including nonprofit organizations, the Lake Champlain Basin Program, state agencies, and other ongoing regional initiatives) that could encompass a heritage corridor initiative within their current activities; and new entities (such as a federally established commission or a new regional, nonprofit organization) that could be created specifically for such a purpose. Each of these options is discussed below. For each, a brief description of the concept is provided, followed by an analysis of its advantages and disadvantages.

For nationally designated heritage corridors/areas, the coordinating entity typically must be able to satisfy several requirements. These include having the legal ability to:

- receive federal funds;
- disburse federal funds to other organizations and units of government;
- account for all federal funds received and disbursed; and
- enter into agreements with the federal government.<sup>1</sup>

All of the options presented below meet these basic criteria, either directly or through existing partnership arrangements.

Also, at a meeting with core project advisors held in Middlebury, Vermont, on July 19, 1999, it was suggested that any of the entities described below could serve as a temporary management “incubator.” Under this scenario, the designated incubator would play a central role for a specified, limited

period of time in (1) coordinating a deeper examination of potential management entities; (2) identifying the most appropriate entity(ies) for long-term management; (3) developing broad support for that conclusion and for the heritage corridor concept more generally; and (4) obtaining and distributing resources to support ongoing heritage-related initiatives. This would set the stage for a later transfer of long-term management authority to the identified organization(s) subsequent to the sunset of the incubator.

### Existing Entities

#### Option #1: Nonprofit Organization

In a number of nationally designated heritage corridors/areas (particularly among those established most recently), existing nonprofit organizations have been specified as the managing entity. Examples include the Ohio & Erie Canal Association for the Ohio & Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor (Ohio); the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, Inc., for the Steel Industry American Heritage Area (Pennsylvania); and the Greenway Conservancy for the Hudson River Valley, Inc., which is comanager with a state agency for the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area (New York).

The study area for the Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor Project (CVHCP) is home to an impressive collection of local, regional, and national nonprofits that are focused on various aspects of heritage resource conservation/preservation/interpretation, tourism promotion, and economic development. Despite this concentration, most of these existing organizations have a very specific geographic and/or thematic niche, and therefore do not appear to be appropriate for consideration as possible coordinating entities for a broadly inclusive national heritage corridor in the region. Among the nonprofits that have been mentioned as possible candidates by regional experts are the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum, located in Basin Harbor, Vermont; the Essex County Visitors Bureau in Crown Point, New York; the Fort Ticonderoga Association in Ticonderoga, New York; the Adirondack North Country Association in

<sup>1</sup> H.R. 1301, Sec.107(a)(2); introduced March 22, 1995.

Saranac Lake, New York; and the Lake Champlain Committee and the Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce, both headquartered in Burlington, Vermont.

Some of the general arguments for and against using an existing nonprofit group are presented below, along with a brief summary of some advantages and disadvantages of the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum (LCMM), which was identified as perhaps the most viable nonprofit managing entity. A more detailed evaluation of LCMM or similar examinations of the other candidates mentioned above would require additional research beyond the scope of this report.

#### **General Advantages of Using an Existing Nonprofit**

- Entity already exists—would not require establishing a new institution.
- May be less threatening to landowners and residents than a more government-oriented option.
- May be less threatening to other existing nonprofits than the creation of a new regional, umbrella nonprofit.
- May be more versatile/agile in fundraising from various sources (government, foundations, corporations, and individuals) to supplement initial governmental appropriations than government-based coordinating entities.
- Likely to be less dependent on political patrons than legislatively created entities such as a federal commission.
- By being perceived as more politically benign than governmentally established entities (e.g., state agencies, Lake Champlain Basin Program, new federal commission), a nonprofit may be better able to establish effective partnerships with a broader range of organizations.
- Without the encumbrances of governmental bureaucracy, a nonprofit may be able to begin corridor implementation sooner in the critical period following designation than governmentally established entities.

- May require less overhead for program administration, potentially making a greater percentage of funding directly available for projects. (Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., reports that 85% of its funding goes directly to programs.)
- Several recently established national heritage corridors/areas (see above) have used existing nonprofits as managing entities.
- “Economies of scale” may be achievable by using existing staff to assist with implementation of heritage program.

#### **General Disadvantages of Using an Existing Nonprofit**

- Among nonprofits that are presently active in the study area, there is no perfect fit with respect to geographic and/or thematic focus; none combines the broad scope of activities likely to be encompassed in a national heritage corridor (e.g., heritage resource conservation/preservation/interpretation; tourism promotion; economic and community development) with an established presence throughout most or all of the study area.
- By identifying one organization to play the lead role, rivalries/jealousies may be created or intensified among the region’s extensive nonprofit community.
- May be less effective in garnering support and buy-in (political and financial) from government (local, state, and/or federal) than a more government-oriented approach.

#### **Specific Advantages of Lake Champlain**

##### **Maritime Museum**

- One of the broadest cultural institutions in the Champlain Basin.
- Active and well-respected in both states.
- Good educational capacity, including on-site and school programs.

- Strong interest in developing more unified interpretation and marketing of Basin's heritage resources.

### Specific Disadvantages of Lake Champlain

#### Maritime Museum

- Some possible components of heritage corridor initiative (e.g., economic/community development) are outside LCMM's core expertise or areas of interest.
- Although active in both states, LCMM is perceived as being primarily a Vermont organization, largely due to its base of operations at Basin Harbor.
- Some jealousies may exist already about the amount of funding LCMM receives through the Lake Champlain Basin Program

#### Option #1a: Two nonprofits as comanaging entities

Given the potential for a bistate heritage corridor in the Champlain Valley, it is conceivable that a nonprofit from each state could be designated to serve as comanaging entities. Under this scenario, each of the organizations would have primary responsibility for coordinating heritage corridor activities and distributing funds within its respective state. The two groups would coordinate and ensure consistency in implementation across the entire corridor through a mechanism created for this purpose. This approach could be politically attractive in providing a way to "even the playing field" between the two states and facilitate tailoring implementation to suit the particular needs in each state. However, it likely would make administering the heritage corridor as a unified initiative somewhat more complicated, time-consuming, and costly, and achieving consistency in implementation across the whole area could prove difficult.

Although no existing national heritage corridor/area has two (or more) nonprofits as its comanaging entities, the concept of shared management is not without precedent. The Greenway Conservancy for the Hudson River Valley, Inc., (a nonprofit public benefit corporation) and the Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council (an agency of the State of New

York) comanage the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area in New York.

#### Option #2: Lake Champlain Basin Program (LCBP)

The LBCP is a cooperative, regional effort among all levels of government, private organizations, and individuals to coordinate and support activities, which protect and enhance the Lake Champlain Basin's environmental, recreational, and cultural resources. Established in 1990 through an act of Congress and funded through federal appropriations (USEPA) since that time, the program focuses on the priorities and actions identified in its basin management plan "Opportunities for Action," completed in 1996. The LBCP is overseen by the Lake Champlain Steering Committee, established in 1988 through a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Governors of New York and Vermont and the Premier of Quebec. The Steering Committee includes representatives from relevant agencies in all three jurisdictions, local officials, federal environmental officials, the chair of a Technical Advisory Committee, and the chairs of Citizens Advisory Committees from New York, Vermont, and Quebec (which provide representation for residents, nonprofit organizations, and other interests).

#### Advantages

- Established, comparatively well-known entity would avoid potential confusion/duplication/competition that could arise with the creation of a new regional entity to manage the heritage corridor initiative.
- Existing partnership with participation from many of the interests (e.g., state and local government, nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, tourism and economic development groups) that would be central to a heritage corridor initiative.
- Covers entire Lake Champlain watershed—New York, Vermont, and Quebec; has broadest geographic scope and regional perspective of any initiative in the CVHCP study area.

- ### Disadvantages

- ▶ LCBP's geographic scope is limited to the Lake Champlain watershed, which does not include parts of the CVHCP study area in the north and south that encompass historic and cultural resources central to the themes of the proposed heritage area.
- ▶ Potential for political opposition in New York, where general resistance to the basin program has been strongest and where concern has been expressed about the Program growing too large.
- ▶ LCBP's direction for cultural and recreational resources (as articulated in "Opportunities for Action") may not be sufficiently broad to encompass the full range of national heritage corridor goals and potential programs.<sup>2</sup>
- ▶ LBCP's environmental constituents could perceive establishing LCBP as managing entity for the heritage corridor as a distraction or detractor from its environmental quality focus.

### Option #3: State Agencies:

In certain instances, state agencies have been identified as the managing entity for recently established national heritage corridors. Examples include the West Virginia Divisions of Tourism and Culture & History for the National Coal Heritage Area; the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism for the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor; the Augusta Canal Authority for the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area in Georgia; and the Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council for the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area (New York). In the Champlain Valley, if both New York and Vermont choose to participate in a national heritage corridor, one or more agencies from each state likely would need to be identified as comanaging entities to ensure equal representation and participation in corridor implementation.

### Advantages

- ▶ May be perceived as less threatening than certain other, less familiar options such as a new federal commission ("it's better to know your devil").
- ▶ By bringing resources and recognition into state agencies, could help to generate political support from Governors and/or state legislatures.
- ▶ "Economies of scale" may be achievable by using existing state agency staff to assist with implementation of heritage program.
- ▶ Precedent has been established by the recently created national heritage corridors/areas (see above) that use state agencies as their managing entities.

### Disadvantages

- ▶ Because jurisdiction over heritage-related resources and issues (e.g., historical, cultural, natural, and recreational resources; tourism; economic and community development) is distributed among several agencies in each state, it could be difficult to single out one from each to serve as lead managing entity. If more than one agency from each state were deemed necessary as comanaging entities, coordination and allocation of federal resources to the project could become quite cumbersome.
- ▶ Carries the baggage of "government."
- ▶ By relying on agencies from each state, it could be more difficult to achieve a truly regional perspective in program development and implementation through this option than through other more regionally based ones (e.g., Lake Champlain Basin Program or new regional nonprofit organization).

<sup>2</sup> The recommendations in "Opportunities for Action" are subject to reassessment and updating every two years by the Lake Champlain Steering Committee.

- May be less versatile/agile than a nonprofit organization (existing or new) in fundraising from diverse sources (i.e., other than federal appropriations and state/local government matching funds).
- Likely to be less responsive to the needs and desires of local communities than more locally based management options (e.g., existing or new nonprofit organization).
- Key stakeholders and general public in Champlain basin may prefer to have heritage initiative managed by an organization or program that is specifically focused on the designated area, rather than being tucked within agencies that have broader, statewide purviews.
- Integrates many of the aspects that a national heritage corridor might also encompass (e.g., linking economic development and tourism with the recognition, conservation, interpretation, and promotion of local heritage and natural, cultural, and recreational resources).
- Covers most of the geographic area included in the Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor project (eight of ten counties).
- Administrative network among the participating counties is established and functioning.

#### **Option #4: Other Existing Regional Initiatives**

Two other existing initiatives in the study area deserve consideration as possible managing entities for a national heritage corridor in the Champlain Valley: the Lake Champlain Byways Program, and the Champlain Valley Heritage Network.

Lake Champlain Byways is a regional planning project funded by the Federal Highway Administration's National Scenic Byway Program and implemented largely through Local Advisory Committees that have been established and staffed in each of eight counties around Lake Champlain (three in New York, five in Vermont). The program, described as "a new approach to economic development through the recognition of local heritage and resources," seeks to use a "grassroots process [to] identify ways to balance economic development and tourism with stewardship of the resources." A Steering Committee comprised of representatives from many of the participating organizations oversees the program; this committee advises the Local Advisory Committees and ensures that the project meets its grant requirements and workplan.

#### **Advantages of Lake Champlain Byways**

- Excellent model of a broad regional initiative that emphasizes local-level implementation (through Local Advisory Committees).

#### **Disadvantages of Lake Champlain Byways**

- Current funding for program expires in fall, 1999.
- Does not include Warren & Saratoga Counties in New York.
- Program is perceived as primarily promoting economic development and tourism, with resource conservation/preservation/interpretation/stewardship as related but secondary elements.
- Program is not officially incorporated as a nonprofit or for-profit organization. Since funding, staff hiring, and other fiscal aspects are handled through a few participating organizations, if Byways were designated to manage a new heritage corridor, one or more of its participating organizations would have to provide those functions (which would likely be at substantially increased levels).
- Current oversight body (Byways Steering Committee) does not include representation from the full spectrum of interests that might desire to be included in the oversight of a national heritage corridor.

The Champlain Valley Heritage Network (CVHN), based in Crown Point, New York, describes itself as "a coalition of local organizations dedicated to local resource enhancement." The Network is an unincorporated collaboration of conservation, business, tourism, agriculture, and civic organizations and government agencies working in a nine-town region along the

western side of Lake Champlain in Essex County. CVHN works to raise awareness among both local residents and visitors of the natural beauty, cultural heritage, and recreational opportunities, in part to build local economic opportunities and stimulate regional pride.

#### **Advantages of Champlain Valley Heritage Network**

- Existing activities similar to those typically involved in national heritage corridor initiatives (i.e., blend of voluntary conservation/economic development/interpretation/heritage resource promotion and other projects that respond to local needs).
- Recognized as innovative and effective, despite limited resources and staffing.
- Excellent model of a diverse coalition within one county that has come together to pursue projects of mutual interest and benefit—a possible model for county-by-county implementation of a heritage corridor initiative.

#### **Disadvantages of Champlain Valley Heritage Network**

- Activities are focused in nine communities along or near Lake Champlain in Essex County, New York. CVHN has intentionally resisted previous appeals to expand to a broader geographic area; for this reason, currently would not be appropriate as a primary managing entity for a broader, bistate heritage corridor.
- CVHN has chosen not to incorporate officially as either a nonprofit or for-profit organization. It prefers to function as a loose coalition of interested organizations, with funding, staff hiring, and other fiscal aspects handled through member organizations; therefore, if CVHN were tapped to manage a new heritage corridor, one or more of its member organizations would have to provide those functions.
- With only a half-time coordinator at present, CVHN has limited capacity to handle the larger mission encompassed in a national heritage corridor. (To date, CVHN has intention-

ally avoided hiring additional staff so that as much funding as possible can be applied directly to projects.)

#### **POSSIBLE NEW ENTITIES**

##### **Option #5: New Regional Nonprofit Organization**

In at least two national heritage corridor/area designations, new nonprofit organizations have been created specifically to serve as coordinating entities: (1) the Quinebaug-Shetucket National Heritage Corridor in Connecticut, where the nonprofit Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., grew from the original grassroots committee that pushed for state and national designation and was subsequently named by the Governor to manage implementation and receive federal funding; and (2) the Essex National Heritage Area in Massachusetts, where the Essex National Heritage Commission, Inc., has recently been established as the managing entity and successor to the original unincorporated organizing force in the region, the Essex Heritage Ad Hoc Commission.

Following on these models, a new nonprofit organization could be created specifically to manage a heritage corridor designation in the Champlain Valley (for instance, a “Champlain Valley Heritage Coalition, Inc.”). Such an organization likely would be most effective if it included a cross-section of relevant interests—including regional experts in heritage resource conservation/interpretation/promotion, tourism, and economic development from government agencies, other nonprofits, and regional organizations (e.g., chambers of commerce)—directly in its management structure, i.e., as members of its board of directors/advisors. This would help to ensure that the activities of the new organization were well-directed to avoid overlap or duplication with the wide range of ongoing initiatives in the region and reduce the likelihood that it would become a competitor with existing organizations for scarce financial resources.

The new organization’s primary focus presumably would be on the area and suite of sites/resources/interpretive themes identified in the national designation, but the group also could include representation from and/or maintain working relations with relevant interests outside that immediate area. This approach

would have short-term benefits in promoting linkages among relevant sites, even if they were not all included within the designated heritage corridor, and would facilitate expansion of the corridor if some of the interests not initially included chose to participate at some point in the future. (Perhaps the most extreme example of this need for adaptability would be expanding the nonprofit into an international organization should heritage interests in Quebec elect to participate and/or if the designation were formally expanded through binational governmental action to include relevant areas in Quebec.)

#### **Advantages**

- As a nongovernmental body, a new nonprofit likely would be less threatening to landowners and residents than government-based management options (e.g., federal commission), and therefore might be more acceptable to local interests across a broader cross-section of the study area.
- May be more versatile/agile in fundraising from various sources (government, foundations, corporations, and individuals) to supplement initial governmental appropriations than government-based coordinating entities.
- May be less dependent on political patrons than legislatively created entities such as a federal commission.
- As a new, nongovernmental entity, a new nonprofit might be more responsive to the needs and desires of local/regional citizens and stakeholders in its structure and approach.
- By being perceived as more politically benign than governmentally established entities (e.g., state agencies, Lake Champlain Basin Program, new federal commission), a new nonprofit may be better able to establish effective partnerships with a broader range of organizations.
- Without the encumbrances of governmental bureaucracy, a new nonprofit may be able to initiate corridor implemen-

tation sooner in the critical period following designation than governmentally established entities.

- As a new entity, a start-up nonprofit would not have any historical baggage to overcome, and perhaps could be tailored to fit the region's needs more precisely than could be achieved by re-tooling an existing organization.
- May require less overhead for program administration, potentially making a greater percentage of funding directly available for projects. (Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., reports that 85% of its funding goes directly to programs.)
- Many recently established national heritage corridors/areas have used nonprofits as the managing entity.

#### **Disadvantages**

- There is no strong existing coalition/working group focused on heritage resources across the study area that could serve as the foundation for building a new organization; such an effort would have to start more or less from scratch.
- Some experts conclude that the study area already has a sufficiently dense concentration of good nonprofits and doesn't need a new one prior to national designation (unlike the situation in some designated areas, such as the Quinebaug-Shetucket National Heritage Corridor).
- Could generate resistance from existing nonprofits due to concerns about increased competition for scarce financial resources.
- Could generate opposition from those individuals who don't want any further cluttering of the institutional landscape ("Not another new entity!").
- Existing nonprofits could become concerned that a new regional organization might overshadow or supercede their existing activities.



- Could generate concerns that the organization would become susceptible to domination/control by the National Park Service.
- Although new nonprofits worked well in certain other national heritage corridor/area designations within a single state (e.g., Quinebaug/Shetucket and Essex), this option could be more difficult to implement effectively in the Champlain Valley, given the potential and desirability of encompassing parts of both New York and Vermont in a heritage designation.
- Organization would need to pass legal/fiduciary requirements for incorporation as a nonprofit. (This would be further complicated if it were desired to have the organization's purview include heritage resources in Quebec, thereby necessitating binational nonprofit incorporation.)

This type of federal commission would not be an entirely new concept in the Champlain Valley; it would be a very close analogy to the Lake Champlain Management Conference (later known as the Lake Champlain Basin Program), established by Congress in the 1990 Lake Champlain Special Designation Act. Clearly, the Management Conference had a somewhat different purview (with its primary focus on developing a pollution prevention, control, and restoration plan for the lake) and different composition (because of its purview) than a heritage corridor commission would have. However, the basic concept is the same: a federally established body comprised of representatives from relevant public/nonprofit/for-profit/academic organizations at the local/regional, state, and national levels, with clearly defined authorities and responsibilities.

#### **Advantages**

#### **Option #6: Federally Established Commission**

Commissions that were created by Congress in the authorizing legislation for the area manage several existing national heritage corridors/districts. The composition of these commissions typically is established in the legislation, allowing Congressional sponsors from the region in question to ensure that important stakeholders are represented (e.g., landowners and residents; local, state, and federal agencies; conservation and recreation groups; business and industry; tourism and economic development officials; etc.). These commissions generally are established as independent agencies of the federal government, but are driven by interests of the regional stakeholders that comprise the lion's share of the membership. Such commissions typically have the authority to hire their own staff, receive and distribute federal funds, and enter into agreements with other governmental units and nongovernmental organizations. Any other authorities also are clarified in the authorizing legislation (e.g., preclusion of any land acquisition or land use regulatory authority). Examples include the Blackstone National Heritage Corridor Commission (Massachusetts and Rhode Island), Delaware and Lehigh Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission (Pennsylvania), and Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission (Virginia).

- Provides a relatively straightforward mechanism for ensuring that significant stakeholders in the region will have direct representation in the managing entity.
- By providing a strong, highly visible, prestigious forum wherein key interests can come together to pursue common goals, federal commissions can be very effective, particularly in bistate situations, where otherwise it may be difficult to ensure that the relevant parties (including both states and the federal government, as well as core local/regional interests) sustain their participation and commitment over time.
- High visibility also can be helpful in creating a unified regional identity and understanding that transcends political boundaries and in leveraging funding for projects that cross boundaries.
- As a new entity, a commission would not have any historical baggage to overcome and perhaps could be tailored to fit the region's needs more precisely than could be achieved by retooling an existing organization.

**Disadvantages**

- Probably more likely than other options to generate political opposition among residents and local officials due to fears that the commission could be or would become a vehicle for the federal government to play an undesired strong role in the region.
- Could generate opposition from those individuals who don't want any further cluttering of the institutional landscape ("Not another new entity!").
- The trend among recently designated national heritage corridors/areas (with the exception of Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District, established in 1996) has been to employ other types of coordinating entities (e.g., state agencies, existing nonprofit organizations) rather than to establish new federal commissions.
- May be less versatile/agile than a nonprofit organization (existing or new) in fundraising from diverse sources (i.e., other than federal appropriations and state/local government matching funds).

## COORDINATING ENTITY OPTIONS FOR OTHER ALTERNATIVES

**State-Designated Heritage Corridor**

A second alternative under consideration in the Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor Project is the possibility of a heritage corridor designation accomplished through state action in New York and/or Vermont, rather than through federal legislation. In fact, New York currently has two relevant initiatives. One is a state-level Heritage Area System, administered by the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation; three heritage areas have been established through the System (Whitehall, Saratoga, and Hudson-Mohawk). The second is a recently established maritime heritage area for Long Island Sound, created by state legislation and administered through the Department of State (Coastal Zone Management program). Vermont does not have a parallel state-level heritage area system, but a

Champlain Valley heritage corridor could be established legislatively, either as the first component of a state-wide program or as a single, stand-alone designation.

Most of the preceding discussion of potential coordinating entities that could be used for a national heritage corridor designation would be relevant to a state-level designation as well, with the following exceptions/additions:

- Given the lack of congressional action, Option #6—a federally established commission—obviously would not be available.
- The coordinating entity would not necessarily need to meet the same requirements as those necessary for a federal designation (i.e., the ability to receive, disburse, and account for federal funds, and to enter into agreements with the federal government).
- Should both New York and Vermont proceed with a state-level designation and choose not to use one of the potential coordinating entities discussed in Section II, the Governors/Legislatures could create either (1) separate oversight bodies to implement the designation in each state, or (2) a joint oversight body to implement the designation across the entire region. Precedent for the concept of a joint oversight body exists in the ongoing Lake Champlain Steering Committee, which was established by the two Governors (and the Premier of Quebec) in 1988 and now has been given responsibility for implementation of the pollution prevention, control, and restoration plan created by the Lake Champlain Management Conference. A similar joint oversight body tailored for a heritage corridor designation would likely be much more effective in achieving a unified regional approach to implementation than separate entities focused only on their respective states. However, any such new entities could generate opposition by further cluttering the institutional landscape in the designated area.

Should only one of the states proceed with a state-level designation and choose not to use one of the potential coordinating entities discussed in Section II, the Governor/Legislature could create a new oversight body to implement designation in that state. Precedent for this approach exists in New York State with the creation of the Mohawk Valley Heritage Corridor Commission, a public benefit corporation. Again, the creation of this type of new coordinating entity could generate opposition by further cluttering the institutional landscape in the designated area.

A state-level designation would have certain other implications for management of the corridor, as well. For example, it is unlikely that federal appropriations specifically targeted for implementation of the heritage corridor designation would be forthcoming. However, federal funding through existing programs presumably would continue to be available. Also, National Park Service participation in implementation would be limited to existing programs, rather than a greater level of assistance and resources that might be available under a national designation. The National Park Service presumably would not have representation on any oversight/managing entity, unless specifically requested by the state(s).

### Quadricentennial Commemoration

The final alternative under consideration in the Champlain Valley Heritage Corridor Project is the possibility of a multiyear commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the arrival of Samuel de Champlain in the Lake Champlain/Richelieu region. For this alternative, any of the possible coordinating entities presented in Section II also could be employed, and the argu-

ments for and against each option would be much the same as those provided in that section.<sup>3</sup> However, the political viability of using a federally established bistate (or international) commission may be somewhat stronger for a commemoration, in part because similar commissions were used effectively in 1909 and 1959 to celebrate the 300th and 350th anniversaries of Champlain's arrival.<sup>4</sup> Given those precedents in the region and the possibility that a "commemoration commission" would be perceived as less threatening than a "national heritage corridor commission," this option may be more politically acceptable for the commemoration alternative than for national heritage corridor designation.<sup>5</sup>

There are also more recent precedents from other parts of the country in which federally established commissions have been used to manage celebrations/commemorations. The De Soto Expedition Trail Commission was established in the Department of the Interior in 1990 to encourage and direct research and coordinate the distribution of interpretive materials to the public regarding the De Soto expedition, the native societies the expedition encountered, and the effects of that contact. Appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission included scholars, resource specialists, a representative from the Smithsonian Institution, and the Superintendent of the De Soto National Monument. In 1992, the Jefferson Commission was established by Congress to commemorate the 250th anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. The Commission, which included eleven citizens appointed by the President and representatives of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government, was charged with planning and developing appropriate programs and activities for the event.

<sup>3</sup> The Lake Champlain Byways program has recently embraced the idea of a 400th anniversary commemoration as the core of its economic and tourism development strategy, and is in the early stages of exploring how this strategy might be best managed and implemented. Should a commemoration be identified as the preferred outcome of the CVHCP, clearly the two efforts should be integrated into one cohesive initiative.

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that federal involvement in those earlier celebrations was coordinated through the State Department due to the international nature of the events; the National Park Service was not involved.

<sup>5</sup> Despite the precedents in 1909 and 1959, it should be kept in mind that much has changed in the region since those times (e.g., regulatory battles in the Adirondack Park; the inflammatory battle over establishment of the Champlain-Adirondack Biosphere Reserve), and, as a result, a federal commemoration commission may be less palatable to local interests now than previously.

Another model that merits examination is the “Celebration 2007” initiative currently underway in Virginia to commemorate the quadricentennial of the founding of Jamestown. The Virginia General Assembly designated the Jamestown/Yorktown Foundation, a state agency, to plan and coordinate the celebration, which is envisioned as a statewide, national, and international event. The Foundation subsequently established a high-profile Steering Committee to oversee the effort; this Committee has twenty-four members, including a number of state politicians, Foundation Board members, Native American and African American representatives, and designees from the Governor’s office, historic preservation groups, and the National Park Service. The Steering Committee, in turn, has created three working subcommittees—Programs & Events, Marketing & Finance, and Logistics—to prepare a master celebration plan. In addition to these state-level activities, a parallel federal commemoration commission is being considered that would help to generate broader national and international awareness and interest in the event and serve as a conduit for federal resources (funding and technical assistance). A similar approach with parallel state and federal commissions was used for the 350th anniversary of the Jamestown settlement in 1957, and was successful in leveraging substantial federal contributions for new infrastructure (for instance, two new visitors centers were constructed, and the Colonial Parkway was completed).